



PLANNING COMMITTEE

30th September 2026 at 9.30 a.m.

Present:

Councillor Goodwin (in the Chair)

Councillors Bright, Callison, Dawkins (substitute for Parkinson), Emmerson, Hudson, Kaczmarek, Lindley, Mayne, Morland (substitute for Patrick) and Taylor (substitute for P. Batson)

Officers in attendance:

- Martin Dixon (Planning Manager)
- Cheryl Jarvis (Development Manager)
- Lara Hattle (Senior Highway Development Control Officer)
- Adam Brockbank (Assistant Transport Planner Highway Development Control)
- Tracy Lovejoy (Agency Lawyer)
- Charlotte Trench (Trainee Solicitor)
- Sophie Pickerden (Committee Support Officer)

Others in attendance:

- Councillor Jackson (Waltham Ward Councillor)

There were eleven members of the public and one member of the press present.

P.26 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received for this meeting from Councillors P. Batson, Parkinson and Patrick.

P.27 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made by Members regarding items on the agenda for this meeting.

P.28 MINUTES

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 2nd September 2026 be approved as a correct record.

P.29 DEPOSITED PLANS AND APPLICATIONS

Item 1 – DM/0907/25/FUL - Land Off Woodland Way, Grimsby Road Waltham

This application had been withdrawn.

Item 2 - DM/0633/25/FUL - Land South Of Anita Grove, Waltham.

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that the item had been brought before the Planning Committee due to an objection from Waltham Parish Council and as it was a departure from the local plan. He outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. Mr Dixon stated that the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Ms Lovejoy stated that as Councillor Morland had left the meeting during the officer's presentation, he was not permitted to take part in the debate or vote.

Mr Nelson spoke as the agent for the application. He said that it was a mixed development consisting of three bungalows and five houses adding to the local housing supply. Mr Nelson said that whilst the site was located outside the 2018 local plan development boundary of Waltham, it was immediately adjacent to it. He said that it was a phase two scheme following the successful phase one development which had been completed by the applicant who was a local builder and who employed local trades. Mr Nelson stated that phase two would provide job opportunities for local people over a period of approximately two years. He said that the small scale development would benefit the local economy. Mr Nelson said that the scheme was a sensitive infill development. He said that the site had previously been subject to appeal in November 2024 and the conclusion of that appeal was that the development would not have a detrimental impact on the character of the area due to the established residential and commercial character of the area. Mr Nelson stated that the key issue of the appeal decision was that the Council could demonstrate a five year supply of housing but this had now changed. He said that the Council could only demonstrate a 3.6 year housing supply whereas previously they had a 13.1 years housing supply. Mr Nelson said that the recent changes to the National Planning Policy Framework supported the development of sensitive infill schemes adjacent to settlements such as this. He said that the application was for a small scale sympathetic scheme which could be successfully assimilated into Cheapside as confirmed by the previous planning inspectorate. Mr Nelson

said that whilst Waltham Parish Council objected to the scheme, the three immediate neighbours supported the scheme on the basis that it was a well thought out scheme. He stated that there were no technical objections to the application. Mr Nelson said that he had worked closely with the council's highways officers to make sure the layout achieved adoptable standards. He asked committee members to approve the application.

Councillor Jackson spoke as a Ward Councillor for the Waltham Ward. He said that he was present to speak against the application. Councillor Jackson noted that the site lay outside the development boundary and expressed the view that the committee should remain consistent with its previous position by opposing development beyond the established boundary. He said that whilst the development may be for only eight dwellings, there had been a lot of developments of similar size in Waltham and this had led to an over-stressing of the infrastructure and a further eight dwellings would not help with that. Councillor Jackson noted that Cheapside had experienced significant development in recent years and highlighted that several sites allocated within the Local Plan along Cheapside had yet to be brought forward. He argued that the proposed development represented a step too far for both Cheapside and Waltham. Councillor Jackson expressed the view that committee members should remain consistent with their previously stated position on development outside the development boundary and, therefore, oppose the application.

Councillor Hudson said that the site was still outside the local plan and committee members were in a difficult position as the previous inspector hadn't gone against the scheme due to the housing type. He said that he understood why the application was recommended for approval as the Council could not demonstrate a five year supply of housing but when he looked at the photos of the site, he didn't think the scheme was acceptable as it was open countryside and he didn't know why anyone would want to build on that and it would be encroaching. Councillor Hudson stated that he didn't think he could support the application.

Councillor Lindley said that the site was outside of the development boundary and he had been consistent regarding applications for sites outside the development boundary. He disagreed with suggestions that the proposal was acceptable simply because it involved only eight dwellings, emphasising that eight dwellings would still constitute an encroachment into the open countryside.. Councillor Lindley said that committee members shouldn't pre-empt what may or may not happen at appeal and should consider applications on their merits and the current application was outside of the development boundary. He could see no other option but to refuse the application. Councillor Lindley said that he would listen to the debate but he didn't think there was anything anyone could say that would change his mind.

Councillor Bright said that he agreed with Councillor Hudson and Councillor Lindley but the issue was that the planning inspectorate did not find that the development would harm the character of the area and the issue was that at the time of the appeal the Council could demonstrate a

five year supply of housing. He said that if the application were refused by the Planning Committee, it would probably be allowed at appeal. Councillor Bright said that he couldn't see any other material planning consideration that the Planning Committee could refuse the application on. He said that he was torn as he didn't like the application, but as the planning inspectorate hadn't found any issues with the development harming the character of the area, he thought the application would be allowed at appeal if refused by the Planning Committee. Councillor Bright said that he would listen to the debate.

Councillor Emmerson said that he agreed with Councillor Bright and that he was also torn regarding the application. He said that there were usually neighbour representations against the application, but the immediate neighbours were in favour of the application. Councillor Emmerson referred to Councillor Jackson's comments regarding infrastructure in the village and suggested that committee members faced a difficult position. He noted that members had opposed developments to the north to avoid Waltham merging with Scartho, while concerns were also being raised about development to the south, placing the committee in a challenging situation regardless of the stance taken. Councillor Emmerson said that there was lots of reasons for and against the application, and he would listen to the debate.

Councillor Lindley proposed that the application be refused.

Councillor Hudson seconded the proposal to refuse the application.

The Chair asked Councillor Lindley and Councillor Hudson for the reasons for their proposal.

Councillor Hudson stated that the site was outside the local plan and in the open countryside.

Mr Dixon said that every application should be considered on their own merits. He said that the local plan was old, and the National Planning Policy Framework was only a few months old and it was outlining that when there was not a five year supply, committee members needed to look at sites outside the local plan and consider other issues with the site. Mr Dixon said that committee members need to realise whilst they may not like an application, they needed to consider whether the scheme was harmful. He said that based on the discussion, the grounds for refusal were that the development would detrimental to the open character of the area.

Councillor Lindley and Councillor Hudson agreed with that reason.

RESOLVED – That the application be refused.

(Note - the committee voted 6 for and 4 against with 1 abstention for the application to be refused.)

Item 3 - DM/0297/26/REM – Land Off Fieldhouse Road, Humberston.

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it had been brought before the Planning Committee due to the number of neighbour objections and an objection from Humberston Parish Council. He outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers.

Ms Hattle said that committee members would be aware that the current application was for reserved matters following the principle of development including the access point being approved at the outline planning stage. She said that during the application process the Highway Authority had discussed the details with the applicant to ensure all detailed matters had been addressed. Ms Hattle said that it's noted that there were a number of objections to the proposals and that there was a lack of clarity on the information that had been provided. She stated that it should be noted that all required highway information and detail was available to view on the planning portal. Ms Hattle said that included:

- An updated Stage 1 and 2 Road Safety Audit, that outlined the same issues as the Road Safety Audit for the outline and also agreed to undertake all required recommendations to ensure there were no road safety concerns. Ms Hattle stated that it should also be noted that the Road Safety Audits were undertaken by independent road safety auditors on behalf of the applicant.
- A detailed drawing showing the first eight metres of the access and the proposed improvements to hardstand the area.
- A plan showing the proposed tapering of the fence line at the first section of the access to allow for improved visibility.
- A plan demonstrating the proposed passing place and that two vehicles could pass each other within the private lane.
- A plan showing the proposed lighting along the private lane.

Ms Hattle said that it should be further noted that it was not necessary for the applicant to have provided any sort of transport statement with the application. She stated that the Highway Authority fully reviewed whether adding an additional five dwellings at the location was considered suitable at the outline application stage. Ms Hattle said that it was determined at that time that five additional dwellings would not present a serious impact on the adopted highway network and the outline application was approved by Planning Committee with access included. She said that therefore she would conclude that the Highway Authority have undertaken a thorough assessment of the detailed matters within the reserved matters application and was content to recommend approval to the planning authority.

Mr Pomfret spoke in objection to the application. Mr Pomfret said that he and his family used the junction every day and that was the junction that

would be used as the proposed entrance and in its current form especially during busy periods it could be like Russian Roulette. Mr Pomfret said that adding in additional traffic that the five dwellings would create without first addressing the access issue would only make a dangerous situation significantly worse. He said that key safety documents needed to assess the proposed access were missing from the planning file. Mr Pomfret stated that there was no full swept path analysis, no visibility splays, no junction geometry, no design that was part of the road safety audit and no road safety audit exceptions. He said that only a small exit showing two cars passing had been provided. Mr Pomfret said that the evidence needed to demonstrate it was a safe access was not there. He stated that condition four could not be discharged. Mr Pomfret said that there was a pre-commencement condition that required detailed access design, visibility improvements, passing place visibility and road safety audit mitigation. He stated that none of that had been submitted. Mr Pomfret stated that he was not opposed to the development itself; however, he objected to the proposed access arrangements, which he considered unsafe for residents, pedestrians, and visitors to the Coach House. As there was missing evidence, he asked committee members to defer the application until required documents were provided and the proposed development access was properly assessed.

Mr Snowden spoke as the agent for the application. He said that he was speaking in support of the application to consider the design of the dwellings, access, drainage and landscaping. Mr Snowden said that he was not there to discuss the principle of development on the land as that was approved at the outline stage and the site was also allocated for housing in the local plan. He stated that the site was within the development boundary and was in a sustainable area. Mr Snowden said that whilst the access was approved at the outline stage, the reserved matters application provided construction details and highway traffic. He said that comments had been raised regarding road safety and as part of the application, Road Safety Audits Stage 1 and 2 had been provided along with swept paths which clarified the development was acceptable in terms of highways. Mr Snowden stated that council officers were also content with the reports provided. He said that the layout of the proposal followed the indicative layout that was agreed at the outline approval stage with the five dwellings positioned as per the outline approval. Mr Snowden said that separation distances had been achieved and ensured no overlooking. He said the council's drainage officer had raised no objections to the application and Anglian Water had confirmed there was capacity for the additional five dwellings. Mr Snowden said that a landscaping plan had been provided and had been approved by the council's trees officer. He said that within the landscaping plan, there was ecological enhancements and this was supported by the ecology report and management plan. Mr Snowden stated that the ecology officer was satisfied with those reports. He said that the site had two public right of ways and their locations had not changed from the outline approval. He said that they had liaised with planning officers during the application process and had reduced the height of the fence at the northern end of

the boundary to allow for more natural surveillance. Mr Snowden concluded that the application benefitted from the outline approval and being an allocated site in the local plan and the detail provided including for access, drainage, landscaping and dwelling design were all supported by officers. He asked committee members to approve the application.

Councillor Hudson said that he thought the application was very straightforward as it was an allocated site in the local plan that had planning approval for five houses. He said that the proposed five houses had excellent separation distances and no overlooking. Councillor Hudson said that access could potentially be the problem but the committee had heard it would be improved by being widened, being lit and that there would be a passing place. He felt that sounded like quite a significant improvement. Councillor Hudson said that he would be happy to approve the application.

Councillor Lindley said that, on paper, it was a good development that would bring into use a land that was otherwise overgrown and he had no issues with the development other than highways. He said that highways was the issue particularly with it being backfill development with the access and he had seen similar issues in his own ward. Councillor Lindley said that he did not get the flavour on how bad the access and egress was for this development. He stated that he took on board the comments made by the objector who supported the development but was concerned with the access and egress. Councillor Lindley said that the Planning Committee could indirectly defer the application and undertake a site visit to look at the issues regarding access and egress. He said that would reassure committee members on the current arrangements and to what extent they would be improved. He reiterated that he took on board the objector's concerns. Councillor Lindley said that he would like to propose a site visit.

Councillor Dawkins said that the site was within his ward and he had visited the site on numerous occasions. He said that it was important to note that if committee members went to view the site during the day, they wouldn't see the issue, they would think the access was tight but when coming out the private lane you could see quite well. Councillor Dawkins said that the problem was when the Coach House was busy during the late afternoon, the access in and out the lane was quite difficult, visibility was near impossible, there was a potential for it to be collision point and with pedestrians down there as well, it was difficult. He stated that he would support the proposal of a site visit and thought committee members needed to look at it. Councillor Dawkins said that it was quite a narrow section and whilst it was proposed to be widened, they could only widen it as far as the lane currently was as, otherwise, they would be encroaching into the car park of the Coach House which was not proposed. He said that he didn't see the harm in committee members undertaking a site visit and would second a proposal for a site visit when appropriate.

Ms Hattle said that numerous site visits were undertaken at the outline stage and that included both herself and Mr Dixon visiting the site on a weekend and on an evening. She said that she was familiar with the Coach House and how busy it was. Ms Hattle reiterated that the principle of the access was improved and we were not looking at whether the access was acceptable now, as that was considered at the outline stage. She said that this application was about the detail, construction and the improvements to the access and they were part of the detail that had been submitted and were acceptable. Ms Hattle reminded the committee that Road Safety Audits had been undertaken, that officers were happy with the information provided and the access was already approved.

Councillor Bright asked whether there was any information missing as the objector had raised that there was missing information.

Ms Hattle responded that all information had been provided and was available on the planning portal including construction details, the passing place, the lighting and swept paths.

Councillor Bright said that the application was for reserved matters and the only concern there seemed to be was about highways and highway safety, but the Highways Team were happy with the application. He said that he couldn't see how committee members undertaking a site visit and making a judgement that it was busy was going to trump the assessments that the Highways Team had done. Councillor Bright said that he couldn't see the benefit in that sense but would listen to the debate.

Councillor Morland said he knew the area well and noted that five houses could generate 10 to 15 vehicles using the access. While acknowledging that highways officers had raised no objections, he said committee members should also consider concerns raised by local residents, as they could provide valuable insight. Referring to Mr Pomfret's objections and comments from Councillors Dawkins and Lindley, he supported a site visit to provide reassurance that the access arrangements were acceptable and to enable members to confidently support the officers' recommendation. He added that dismissing public concerns because they came from non-professionals would be demeaning and that a site visit would help ensure all concerns had been properly considered.

Councillor Dawkins said that it was the improvements that committee members needed clarity on and they needed to visit the site to see where the passing place was going to be and where it was being extended to, as it was hard to judge looking at the presentation slides. He said that he still supported the idea of a site visit.

Councillor Kaczmarek sought clarification from officers on if any part of the application was relevant to the access or had that all been decided at the previous application.

Mr Dixon responded that the site had planning permission for five dwellings. Mr Dixon stated that the access point was approved at the

outline stage and this application was for the detail. He said that access was not just about where vehicles came out onto the road, but also how you came into the site, the access to the properties, the driveways and the details in terms of the turning head. Mr Dixon said that it was that kind of detail that committee members were considering, not the principle of where it came out or the flows or the levels of traffic that came out. He said that the substantive permission was the outline application and the reserved matters application was effectively an application to discharge the condition of the outline for the reserved details to be determined but, as mentioned by Councillor Dawkins, it did include the detail of the access. Mr Dixon said that committee members were not determining the access point but the application did include the detail work.

Councillor Kaczmarek said that he could see both sides of the argument and understood the call for a site visit to understand the detail of the application but he was struggling to see what committee members would get out of it, and he wasn't sure they would understand it better if there was a site visit. Councillor Kaczmarek stated that he was torn and would listen to the debate.

Councillor Bright responded to Councillor Morland's point, noting that the application was a reserved matters application and that the access arrangements were not for determination by the committee. He said that, while a site visit might allow members to observe conditions on site, any decision on highway impacts should be based on the evidence and assessments provided by highways officers. He questioned what material planning grounds there would be for refusal if all the necessary evidence supported the proposal. He emphasised that he was not suggesting members should ignore objectors' views, but that appropriate weight should be given to professional advice. While members might consider the site busy, highways officers' conclusions were based on detailed evidence. He therefore did not believe a site visit would alter the planning considerations in this case.

Councillor Mayne said that he agreed with Councillor Bright. He said that he thought you could visit the site ten times on ten different times of day and get ten different results. Councillor Mayne stated that he didn't think a site visit would be conclusive of anything.

Councillor Callison said that we trust our officers and that's why we employ our officers. He said that he would be supporting the application.

Councillor Morland sought clarification that there had been a couple of Road Safety Audit's done by the developers.

Ms Hattle responded that a Road Safety Audit Stage 1 was undertaken at outline stage whereby the applicant said they would follow all the recommendations of the Road Safety Audit. She said that as part of the current application the applicant had an independent Road Safety Audit Stage 1 and 2 undertaken, were the same issues were raised which was passing places, lighting and tapering of the fence line and they accepted

to take on all the recommendations and undertake the works needed. Ms Hattle stated that the Road Safety Audit was fully independent of the Highways Authority.

Councillor Morland said that still left us where we were and some committee members wanted a site visit and some didn't.

Councillor Lindley said that Councillor Kaczmarek had said he was torn but he didn't think there was much to be torn about. He said that committee members were broadly supportive of the scheme, but they were asking for a site visit to address the issues around highways in terms of access and egress. Councillor Lindley said that by going on a site visit, committee members were indirectly deferring the application for a month, to then go on the site visit and come back next month to have a discussion and make a decision. He said that it was not a big decision to make. Councillor Lindley stated that as Planning Committee members they had a right to that.

Councillor Bright said that he didn't think Members could refute the evidence with a site visit.

Councillor Lindley proposed that the application be deferred in order to allow for a site visit to take place. This was seconded by Councillor Dawkins.

Councillor Dawkins said that the site visit was not for committee members to decide whether the lane was suitable but was to look at the improvements that would be made. He said that you could not beat being there in person as you couldn't tell from the maps shown on the screen what was suitable and they were relying on highways officers. Councillor Dawkins said that he wanted there to be a site visit for clarity and to reassure the objector what was going to happen as he was obviously concerned. He said that he just wanted to know, so there was no confusion moving forward what had been agreed.

The Chair said that she could understand where people were coming from asking for a site visit, but she agreed with Councillor Callison that we would go look at the access and egress but no work would have been done on that.

The committee took a vote and upon a vote, four voted for and seven voted against the proposal to defer the application for a site visit.

Councillor Hudson proposed that the application be approved with conditions. This was seconded by Councillor Kaczmarek.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

(Note - the committee voted 8 for 3 against for the application to be approved with conditions.)

Item 4 - DM/0328/26/FUL - Land To South Of The Georgian House, Main Road, Barnoldby Le Beck.

Mr Dixon introduced the application and explained that it had been brought before the Planning Committee due to a call in from Councillor Mayne. He outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. Mr Dixon said that the site was located outside the development boundary and in an area of open countryside. He stated that the development would have a detrimental impact on the rural character of the area and would not be a sustainable form of development. Mr Dixon said that the position with regard to housing need had been taken into account but in this case did not justify the development. He said that the application was therefore recommended for refusal.

Mr Glass spoke in objection to the application. He said that the grounds of objection had been documented in previous applications and appeals. Mr Glass said that the specific point he wanted to make was that the large dwelling to the south of the site which was granted to be built in open countryside, was of exceptional design. Mr Glass said that he hadn't objected to that as he was in favour of good development but he was concerned about a precedent being established whereby if somebody managed to get permission to build in the open countryside under a certain provision in law, and then that created what appeared to be infill but was not infill. He said that the principle that was established was for an exceptional dwelling in the countryside.

Mr Barford spoke as the applicant for the application. He thanked Councillor Mayne for calling the application into the Planning Committee. Mr Barford stated that the development was small and proportionate. He said that the application was for three small modest, detached houses for families. He said that they would be offered as self-build plots which would provide benefits to the local economy. Mr Barford said that the site was not an isolated countryside site, it was in fact a small infill site within a group of established houses. He said that the site sat immediately alongside residential development with existing dwellings, existing access and a public right of way through the site. Mr Barford stated that the site was surrounded by residential development and three of the existing houses used the same access road that the proposed development would use. He stated that the Civic Society had concluded that the site was not an isolated intrusion into the open countryside but a site surrounded by existing residential development. Mr Barford said that the planning context since their previous application had materially changed. He said that their previous appeal was decided in 2024 when the Council could demonstrate a five year housing supply and the National Planning Policy Framework had also materially changed. Mr Barford said that the National Planning Policy Framework now provided a specific route for housing outside settlements where there was an evidenced unmet need. He referred to policy S51J and said that the Council only had a 3.6 year housing supply. Mr Barford said that the site was physically related to Barnoldby Le Beck and was surrounded by existing houses with an existing access serving

neighbouring properties. He referred to policy S51E and said that his proposal followed that policy as his proposal was not three houses being pushed into an open field, it was instead a small contained gap within an established group of houses with residential development surrounding the site. Mr Barford said that all of the technical objections had been resolved. He stated that the only objections to the scheme were from people who lived in the village and most of the points they had raised were dismissed by statutory policies. Mr Barford said that the key question was not whether the site was outside the settlement boundary as he accepted it was, the question was whether the proposal should be treated as unacceptable countryside development or whether it fell within the forms of development which the new National Planning Policy Framework specifically recognised as appropriate for outside settlement boundaries. He stated that he believed the evidence showed it did. Mr Barford said that it was a limited infill opportunity within an established group of houses, would address an unmet housing need and was well related to the settlement. He asked committee members to consider the site as it was on the ground rather than a line drawn on a plan. Mr Barford said that the Civic Society had initially objected to the application as they had believed the proposal represented an intrusion into the open countryside, but after visiting the site they decided it would not be an intrusion into the open countryside as the site was surrounded by residential developments. He stated that a site visit would demonstrate that it was a contained infill site rather than an open countryside development.

Councillor Lindley said that there were three key points that jumped out to him, and they were the detrimental impact on the rural character of Barnoldby Le Beck, the encroachment on the open countryside and the site was outside the development boundary. He stated that for those reasons, he would not be supporting the application.

Councillor Bright said that he agreed with Councillor Lindley and the planning inspectorate also reached the same conclusion. He said that whilst the Council could not demonstrate a five year housing supply, that did not mean that development should automatically be approved and there were other requirements that needed to be satisfied. Councillor Bright said that there was an issue with sustainability and the impact on the countryside.

Councillor Mayne said that the site was within his ward and there was lots of objections to it. He stated that he would be voting against the application.

Councillor Lindley proposed that the application be refused. This was seconded by Councillor Mayne.

RESOLVED - That the application be refused.

(Note - the committee voted unanimously for the application to be refused.)

Item 5 - DM/0732/25/OUT – Wayside, Brigsley Road, Waltham.

Ms Jarvis introduced the application and explained that it had been brought before the Planning Committee due to an objection from Brigsley Parish Council and as it represented a departure from the local plan. She outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. Ms Jarvis stated that the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Nelson spoke as the agent for the application. He said that the application was for two self-build dwellings and the site was located in the parish of Waltham adjacent to Brigsley. Mr Nelson said that the host property was located within the boundary of Brigsley and the rear garden fell outside. He said that the site technically was within the Waltham parish area and Waltham Parish Council supported the application. Mr Nelson stated that adjoining Brigsley Parish Council objected to the application on highway grounds with it being proposed that four dwellings used one access. He said that the scheme accorded with the Council highways design guide and did not exceed more than five dwellings on a private drive. Mr Nelson said that the visibility was good in both directions and the council's highways officer had raised no objection to the application. He stated that the principle of development had previously been established and the site location was sustainable. Mr Nelson said that significant material weight should be given to the fact that there were no neighbour objections. He said that the proposed soft landscaping would help assimilate the scheme into the site and would not create an adverse impact on the character of the area. Mr Nelson said that the scheme would also not have an adverse impact on neighbouring amenity due to the separation distances. He stated that the scheme was also acceptable in terms of highways safety. Mr Nelson said that there were other examples of development in the area. He asked committee members to approve the application.

Councillor Jackson spoke as a Ward Councillor for the Waltham Ward. He said the site was outside of the development boundary and even though it was only for two properties, the same rules applied. Councillor Jackson said that there had been lots of development in Waltham including Brigsley and this was further encroachment into the village and would be an additional burden on already overstretched infrastructure. He said that as Councillor Morland had stated, we needed to listen to what local people said and Brigsley Parish Council concerns regarding the access needed to be listened to. Councillor Jackson said that he hoped that as the site was outside the development boundary and as there were concerns over the junction arrangements, the application would be refused.

Councillor Bright sought clarification on the site as it was not physically in Waltham.

Ms Jarvis responded that the site was classed as Waltham and had a Waltham postcode. She said that Waltham and Brigsley boundaries were

close together and the site was on the edge of Brigsley. Ms Jarvis said that the site was assessed as being Waltham but she appreciated that from a spatial perspective there was a consideration in terms of that inter relationship and how it was viewed with Brigsley.

Councillor Bright sought clarification that officers had based their consideration on the site being sustainable based on it being a Waltham address rather than where it physically was.

Mr Dixon responded that there was a nearby housing site that was deemed sustainable and officer's view was that the application site was not more distant than the housing site. He said that it would be hard to argue that the application site was less sustainable than the housing site that had planning permission and had been implemented.

Councillor Bright said that officers were saying it was a level two settlement but in reality it was located within a level four settlement even though it had a Waltham postcode.

Mr Dixon said that you could still be in a Waltham Parish but be a long way from being sustainable as parish areas could be large. He said that the plot had had planning permission before and the officer's view was that the site was sustainable and whilst it was more on the edge, having regard to what was around the site, it would be unreasonable to say the site was not sustainable.

Councillor Bright said that he tried to be consistent and the site was on the edge and surrounded by green fields. He stated that he would listen to the debate.

Councillor Hudson said that when you factor in where the other houses to be built would be, that would leave us with one field between Waltham and Brigsley. He said that the proposed development would add to the closing of the gap between Waltham and Brigsley and he wasn't sure committee members wanted to do that. Councillor Hudson said that the site was in Waltham as that was where the boundary was and if it was in Brigsley, it would have been a different level of settlement and officers probably wouldn't have recommended approval. He stated that he was surprised that Waltham Parish Council had not objected and neither had the neighbours. Councillor Hudson said that he had concerns about the closing of the strategic gap, but was surprised that the people who had the most interest in the application hadn't objected. He said that he was torn about the application.

Councillor Lindley said that the application was a typical example of what can happen when you nibble away at strategic gaps between villages and they lose their identity. He said that when you look at the map, you could not appreciate the severity of the bend and traffic went down there at speed. Councillor Lindley stated that he couldn't see anyway of mitigating that and the proposal involved two more houses using an access point that already served two houses and it was at quite a precarious point in

the road where it bends. He said that the site was outside of the development boundary. Councillor Lindley said that it was about principle rather than the size of the development, and with principles you had to be consistent and on principle he couldn't support the application.

Councillor Morland said the site was outside the development boundary and that members had previously opposed development encroaching into green space. He argued that refusing the application would be inconsistent with earlier discussions, where members had been advised not to challenge officers' professional recommendations. He maintained that questioning officer advice was a legitimate part of members' role in reflecting residents' concerns and providing a lay perspective. He added that members who had previously argued for relying on officer advice would, by refusing the application, be departing from that advice in this case.

Ms Lovejoy clarified that the Planning Committee was making the decision and officers were providing advice. She said that some matters such as highways were more technical than others but there was no suggestion that committee members had to follow officers.

Councillor Morland stated that he was not challenging the professionalism of officers but the Planning Committee were in a conundrum in whether they accept the professional advice or not. He said that he was talking about committee members not officers and the professionalism of officers was not in doubt but what he was suggesting was that we may be voting against the professional advice given but some members of the panel suggested we shouldn't.

Councillor Bright said that there was no conundrum and traffic assessments undertaken by independent companies and judgement calls were different things. He said that when it came to judgement calls, he had agreed with officers in the past and disagreed. Councillor Bright reiterated that there was no conundrum.

Councillor Mayne said that he was not happy with the confrontational approach some councillors had with officers. He said that he was happy to go with the expertise of officers.

Councillor Lindley said that officer's information was valuable but we didn't always follow it and there was no obligation to do so. He said that votes were not always unanimous and some committee members followed the advice and some made a different decision and that's what made the Planning Committee work, otherwise every application would be determined under delegated powers. Councillor Lindley stated that he valued the officers' advice but as individuals we had the right to make a decision based on our own thoughts and interpretation of that advice.

Councillor Emmerson said that each application had its own merits and no two applications were the same. He said that he could not see a problem with the application as the site was out the way, was only for two dwellings

and was well screened. Councillor Emmerson said that he saw no reason to refuse the application. He stated that there were also no neighbour objections to the application.

Councillor Kaczmarek said that he agreed with Councillor Emmerson. He said that in terms of encroachment, the house that was already under construction was closer than the proposed two dwellings so he felt like that point was weakened. Councillor Kaczmarek said that he was leaning towards supporting approval of the application.

Councillor Dawkins said that there had been other applications for sites not in the local plan considered today that had been refused and this one was not in the local plan either. He said that he was confused as to why committee members were considering approving the application. Councillor Dawkins stated that the site was not in the local plan and whilst it might be allowed on appeal, he was considering the facts and the site was not in the local plan.

Councillor Mayne proposed that the application be approved with conditions.

Councillor Callison seconded the proposal to approve the application.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

(Note - the committee voted 6 for 5 against for the application to be approved with conditions.)

Item 6 – DM/0881/25/FUL - Rear Of 116 Humberston Avenue, Humberston, Grimsby.

Ms Jarvis introduced the application and explained that it had been brought before the Planning Committee due to an objection from Humberston Village Council. She outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. Ms Jarvis explained that as a result of the new National Planning Policy Framework an additional condition needed to be added regarding swift boxes and bricks. She stated that the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Mr Nelson spoke as the agent for the application. He said that the objection from Humberston Village Council was a standard objection. Mr Nelson said that the character of Humberston Avenue had evolved significantly and it therefore was very different to object to the principle of the scheme on character grounds. He said that it was a low density two dwelling scheme. Mr Nelson said that a four dwelling scheme had been approved recently by Planning Committee on a similar size application site. He said that there had been two objections received from residents, one of those was from an immediate neighbour and that resulted in the scheme being amended to address the concerns raised. Mr Nelson said that the properties were now proposed to be dormer style properties to

reduce overlooking and a potential massing impact. He said that the proposed dormer style properties were proposed to be set deep within their perspective plots. Mr Nelson stated that a 10m deep tree and rain guarding area was proposed to the front of the properties to provide screening and also provided sustainable form of surface water drainage. He said that what was proposed was a good scheme for the local area and provided a better use of the land. Mr Nelson asked committee members to approve the application.

Councillor Bright said that the application wouldn't have been brought before the Planning Committee without the objection from the parish council. He said that officers had addressed the neighbours' concerns and he couldn't see a reason to refuse the application.

Councillor Taylor said that most of the back garden developments in the area were single dwellings and there was a property in Humberston Avenue where the access was right next to the building where the applicant had planning permission, then moved out and there was now anti-social behaviour. He said that most of the back garden developments were for one dwelling, not two and it looked like they were trying to squeeze in as much as they could.

The Chair said that there had been previous applications for Humberston Avenue back garden developments and they were for three or four dwellings if not more.

Councillor Mayne said that there had been a lot of development down Humberston Avenue and it seemed every other house had nearly had back garden development and it seemed hypocritical to be against this development.

The Chair agreed with Councillor Mayne.

Councillor Mayne said that the application ticked all of the boxes.

Councillor Lindley said that Humberston Village Council did have a standard objection to backfill development and they should have objected thirty years ago when we started to see the backfill development. He said that the back fill development in Humberston Avenue varied in sizes. Councillor Lindley said that the proposed dwellings were close but they comfortably fitted into the site's footprint.

Councillor Morland said that he agreed with Councillor Taylor. He said that it was usually one dwelling that was proposed for back fill development in Humberston Avenue, now it was two. He said that was not a reason to refuse the application but it was something to be aware of as how far do we go in reducing spatial distance between dwellings on backfill sites. Councillor Morland said that it was difficult to object on precedent but we do need to be conversant of the amount that was being squeezed into sites.

The Chair said that one of her first site visits as a member of the Planning Committee was on Humberston Avenue for seven houses and it was approved. She said that it was surprising how big the gardens were.

Councillor Kaczmarek said his only concern was the proximity of the three driveway accesses. While he would have preferred them to be incorporated into the existing access, he did not consider this sufficient grounds to refuse the application.

Councillor Emmerson said that it was part of Humberston Village Council culture to object to these applications, but it was also part of the culture of Humberston Avenue to have this type of back fill development. He said that the Planning Committee had approved so many similar applications for the area and it was hypocritical to refuse the current application.

Councillor Lindley proposed that the application be approved with conditions. This was seconded by Councillor Mayne.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

(Note - the committee voted 8 for 3 against for the application to be approved with conditions.)

Item 7 - DM/0100/25/FUL - Rear Of 43 Bramhall Street, Cleethorpes.

Ms Jarvis introduced the application and explained that it had been brought before the Planning Committee due to a call in from Councillor Kaczmarek. She outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. Ms Jarvis stated that the proposal would not present any adverse impacts with regard to design or neighbouring residential amenity. She said that whilst the benefits of re-use and the visual enhancement the proposal would bring were noted, the proposal failed to demonstrate that flood risk measures for the proposed dwelling were adequate to exclude the future 0.5% breach depths and ensure the safety of future occupants for the lifetime of the development. Ms Jarvis stated that the application was therefore recommended for refusal.

Councillor Hudson said that thirteen years ago there had been an application similar to this one and committee members were told they couldn't approve a shop being converted due to flood risk, but for thirteen years someone had been able to live there otherwise it would have been derelict. He said that over the last thirteen years, there had been sensible decisions to approve other similar applications and shops that were now lived in and they still hadn't flooded. Councillor Hudson said that on occasion, the Planning Committee had gotten it wrong and not approved similar applications and those buildings were still empty now. He said that if that building flooded, every other building in the area would as well and they also had an upstairs; people were not going to sit there and drown. Councillor Hudson said that if it was new building, he would have a

different opinion but this building was there and it looked a mess and it could be a useful home. He stated that this was one occasion where he disagreed with officers.

Councillor Morland said that he agreed with Councillor Hudson. He said that there were other areas in his ward with similar developments. Councillor Morland said that he believed the building had been empty for a length of time and he saw no reason for it to be developed as other buildings had been. Councillor Morland said that flooding could happen anywhere and there were other houses located in the flood zone. He said that the building would bring some accommodation and uplift the area.

Councillor Lindley said that he disagreed with Councillor Hudson and Councillor Morland. He said the difference with the application Councillor Hudson had referred to from thirteen years ago was that there was an option for them to have the sleeping accommodation upstairs whereas the building had no upstairs.

Councillor Hudson stated that there was an upstairs.

Councillor Lindley said that he took on board the points raised by Councillor Hudson and Councillor Morland about bringing the building back into use but committee members needed to be careful when considering flood risk as it was a serious issue. He stated that he would be supporting the officer's recommendation.

Ms Jarvis said that typically with these applications, there was a discussion about the sequential test but with this application it was a case of whether the development would be safe or not. She stated that the local plan was clear that flood risk was a material consideration and we needed to ensure developments were safe through their lifetimes for occupants.

Councillor Bright said that the test was is the highest flood risk was one in every hundred years. He sought clarification about raising the ground floor levels.

Ms Jarvis responded that they could not meet the standards due to the internal head heights and the Environment Agency letter had confirmed they were not even close to achieving an acceptable level.

Councillor Bright said that it came down to evacuation plans and everybody on the street would be subject to the same flood risk. He said that there was an upstairs and if there was a flood warning they would evacuate or go upstairs if safe. Councillor Bright said that to leave the building as it was when there were all those houses around it subject to the same issues didn't seem credible. He said that having evacuation plans and an upstairs gave you the chance to make the development safe.

Councillor Taylor said that full Council had agreed to look at bringing old unused buildings back into use. He said that he couldn't remember any big major flooding since the 1970s and the new sea defences. Councillor

Taylor said that if we were agreeing that we needed to bring unused old buildings back into use, this was a prime example and he would be supporting the application.

Councillor Dawkins said that if it was up to Environment Agency we wouldn't have anything because as far as they were concerned we were a prime area to flood. He said that there had been an application for a motorhome site and the Environment Agency had wanted the Planning Committee to refuse the application as it had flooded seventy four years ago and it might flood again. Councillor Dawkins said that the site may flood but it would have to be a ten feet high flood as you would be upstairs. He said that it would not be a tsunami, the water would gradually go up. Councillor Dawkins stated that he did not think we had major flood issues in the area, they might say on paper we had but they were years apart and the last major flooding was in the 1970s and then sea defences were put in. He said that the building was the same as every other property down the street and if not developed it would be left to rack and ruin.

Councillor Callison said that officers had a job on their hands and had a procedure to follow and we had to take that into consideration. However, he disagreed with the recommendation.

Councillor Mayne said that he agreed with Councillor Dawkins and Councillor Taylor and we did agree to bring buildings back into use. He said that it would be a shame to leave the property rotting for what was a very low risk.

Councillor Dawkins proposed that the application be approved. This was seconded by Councillor Taylor.

The Chair asked Councillor Dawkins and Councillor Taylor for the reasons for their proposal.

Ms Jarvis said that based on committee members discussions they felt that the regeneration benefits outweighed the flood risk and that through an appropriate mitigating strategy such as flood warnings and an evacuation plan that satisfied the flood risk.

Councillor Dawkins said that there was also an upstairs.

Councillor Bright said that if there was a flood warning authorities would be advising people in the street and the occupiers of this property would be treated the same.

Mr Dixon stated that flood risk was not about looking back it was about looking forward and sea levels were rising. He said that committee members had to consider the advice provided and flood risk shouldn't be dismissed on the grounds of what had or hadn't happened in the past.

Councillor Callison said that building control would be looking at this development.

Councillor Taylor stated that we had better sea defences now.

Mr Dixon said that flood risk was not solely about risk to life but was also about the misery of flooding.

Councillor Taylor said that if someone bought the property they would be made aware of the flood risk under their land registry.

Ms Lovejoy stated that flood risk was a material consideration, and you could balance flood risk against other considerations such as regeneration, mitigation and safety measures. She said that there was a fine line between doing that and dismissing the Environment Agency's assessment of flood risk.

Councillor Kaczmarek said the committee could add conditions as mitigation and in the past had required applicants to build a flood resistant garden wall, limited sleeping accommodation to the first floor and placing electric sockets higher on the wall.

Ms Lovejoy said that as both Councillor Emmerson and Councillor Mayne had left the meeting during the debate, they could not take part in the vote.

Ms Jarvis outlined suggested conditions.

Councillor Bright asked if the sockets being raised could be added as a condition.

Mr Dixon said that there would be a condition regarding a flood mitigation scheme but it was important to be mindful that the Environment Agency was talking about up to 0.9m of flood depth, so the sockets would be very high.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

(Note - the committee voted 7 for 2 against with 2 abstentions for the application to be approved with conditions.)

Councillor Dawkins left the meeting at this point.

Item 8 - DM Land With Ponds South Of Humberston Avenue, Humberston.

Mr Jarvis introduced the application and explained that it had been brought before the Planning Committee due to an objection from Humberston Village Council. She outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. Ms Jarvis stated that the application was recommended to be approved for a limited period with conditions.

Councillor Hudson said that he couldn't see any harm in extending the permission for another two years.

Councillor Bright stated that he agreed with Councillor Hudson and he hoped the access would be in place in two year's time.

Councillor Lindley said that he took on board the mitigating reasons why there had been a delay and given that the applicant already had approval for a permanent access, he saw no reason to not extend the permission for a limited period.

Councillor Morland said that he agreed with what had been said by other committee members.

Councillor Hudson proposed that the application be approved for a limited period with conditions. This was seconded by Councillor Bright.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved for a limited period with conditions.

(Note - the committee voted unanimously for the application to be approved for a limited period with conditions.)

Item 9 - DM/0546/26/FULA - Milchester House, Main Road, Barnoldby Le Beck.

Ms Jarvis introduced the application and explained that it had been brought before the Planning Committee due to comments that had been received from Barnoldby Le Beck Parish Council. She outlined to the committee the key matters regarding the application as detailed in the officer's report within the agenda papers. Ms Jarvis stated that the application was recommended for approval with conditions.

Ms Robinson spoke as the agent for the application. She said that they had done their due diligence with the application and had submitted a pre application. Ms Robinson said that there had been some concerns raised by planning officers and that had resulted in a reduction in the size of the front extension and the roofline would be below the main dwelling. Ms Robinson stated that the council's trees officer was happy with the application. She said that she had previously worked with the applicant on their rear extension and there were never any concerns raised regarding construction times and noise and they wanted to retain their good relationship with their neighbours.

Mr Wade spoke as the applicant for the application. He said that the development would enable him to provide appropriate accommodation care for his mother in law. Mr Wade said that they had discussed the proposal with his neighbours who were supportive of it.

Councillor Lindley said that it was a straightforward application which had support from the neighbours. He said that in terms of the concerns raised

by Barnoldby Le Beck Parish Council, there had been clarification about the tree position and the constructions hours would be addressed under condition three. Councillor Lindley stated that he was in support of the application.

Councillor Bright said that the applicant had worked with officers to get the application right and the neighbours were happy with it. He said that he saw no reason to not approve the application.

Councillor Emmerson said that the application was for an extension to an existing house. He said that the applicant had explained why they wanted the extension and there were also no neighbour objections. Councillor Emmerson said that officers had put forward how Barnoldby Le Beck Parish Council's concerns could be mitigated.

Councillor Lindley proposed that the application be approved with conditions.

Councillor Emmerson seconded the proposal to approve the application with conditions.

RESOLVED – That the application be approved with conditions.

(Note - the committee voted unanimously for the application to be approved with conditions.)

P.30 PLANS AND APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

The committee received plans and applications determined by the Director of Economy, Environment and Infrastructure under delegated powers during the period 21st August – 17th September 2026.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

P.31 PLANNING APPEALS

The committee received a report from the Director of Economy, Environment and Infrastructure regarding outstanding planning appeals.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

P.32 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED – That the press and public be excluded for the following business on the grounds that its discussion was likely to disclose exempt information within paragraph 6 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).

P.33 ENFORCEMENT ISSUES

The committee considered any requests from any member of the committee to discuss any enforcement issues.

RESOLVED – That the enforcement matters raised by committee members be further investigated.

There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting at 12.40pm.

Minute of the Planning Committee 30th September 2026

Item: 1

Application Number: DM/0907/25/FUL

Application Type: Full Application

Application Site: Land Off Woodland Way Grimsby Road Waltham North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Erect a residential development of nine dwellings including public open space, access roads and associated infrastructure. (Amended Site Plan and House Types received July 2026)

Applicant's Name and Address: Mr Peter Strawson Idyllic Estates East Ravendale Farm East Ravendale North East Lincolnshire DN37 0RX	Agent's Name and Address: Mr Matt Deakins Ross Davy Associates Pelham House 1 Grosvenor Street Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN32 0QH
--	---

Deposited: 21st October 2025

Accepted: 8th December 2025

Expiry Date: 2nd February 2026

Agreed Extension of Time Date: 2nd October 2026

Case Officer: Richard Limmer

Decision: Withdrawn

The agent requested the application to be withdrawn. It was not considered for debate at the planning committee meeting.

Minute of the Planning Committee 30th September 2026

Item: 2

Application Number: DM/0633/25/FUL

Application Type: Full Application

Application Site: Land South Of Anita Grove Waltham North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Erect 8 dwellings and garages with associated works to include provision of attenuation pond

Applicant's Name and Address: Mr And Mrs Glover C/O Agent	Agent's Name and Address: Mr Dieter Nelson Dieter Nelson Planning Consultancy Unit 2 Cleethorpes Business Centre Jackson Place Wilton Road Humberston Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN36 4AS
--	--

Deposited: 21st July 2025

Accepted: 12th August 2025

Expiry Date: 7th October 2025

Agreed Extension of Time Date:

Case Officer: Richard Limmer

Decision: Refused

1 The proposed development is located outside of the development boundary as established through the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013 -2032 (Adopted 2018) and shown upon the proposals map as within open countryside. The proposal is not supported by exceptional reasons to allow the development within the open countryside. The adverse impacts are not justified by the shortfall in the supply of deliverable housing and its location extending into the open countryside would cause visual harm through the physical build to the detriment of the visual amenity of the area. The development would be contrary to Policies 5 and 42 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013 -2032 (adopted 2018) and advice in the National Planning Policy Framework 2026.

Minute of the Planning Committee 30th September 2026

Item: 3

Application Number: DM/0297/26/REM

Application Type: Reserved Matters

Application Site: Land Off Fieldhouse Road Humberston North East
Lincolnshire

Proposal: Reserved Matters Application pursuant to DM/0493/22/OUT to consider access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale to erect 5 detached dwellinghouses with parking, landscaping, boundary treatments and associated works - AMENDED PLANS & FURTHER INFORMATION REC 14-07-2026

Applicant's Name and Address: Ms D Blythe 3 Mill Grange Caistor Lincolnshire LN7 6JG	Agent's Name and Address: Mr Daniel Snowden Ross Davy Associates Pelham House 1 Grosvenor Street Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN32 0QH
--	---

Deposited: 22nd April 2026

Accepted: 22nd April 2026

Expiry Date: 17th June 2026

Agreed Extension of Time Date: 12th October 2026

Case Officer: Lauren Stinson

Decision: Approved with Conditions

- 1 Condition
The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans:

Site Location Plan - RD6129-01
Proposed Site Plan - RD:6129 - 03 REV D
Proposed Plans and Elevations - Type A - RD6129-04
Proposed Plans and Elevations - Type B - RD6129-05
Proposed External Works Plan - RD:6129 - 06 REV C
Proposed Landscaping Plan - RD6129-07 REV-A
S184 Layouts and Construction Details - 1115-2611-CIV-100 P3
S278 Construction Details - 1115-2611-CIV-130 P1
Engineering Plan - 1115-2611-CIV-10-P

Reason

For the avoidance of doubt in the interests of proper planning and in accordance with Policies 5, 22, 33, 34, 36, 38, 39, 41 and 42 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018).

2 Condition

Prior to any development commencing above damp course, details of external materials to be used in the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall then be carried out in accordance with the details approved.

Reason

To maintain the character of the area and in accordance with Policies: 5 and 22 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018).

3 Condition

The development shall be built out in strict accordance with the Construction Traffic Management Plan (RD6129LA08-04-26) unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

In the interests of highway safety and to protect the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties in accordance with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018).

4 Condition

The access, roads and footways, and their management, shall be undertaken in strict accordance with the following details:

Proposed Site Plan - RD:6129 - 03 REV D
Proposed External Works Plan - RD:6129 - 06 REV C
S184 Layouts and Construction Details - 1115-2611-CIV-100 P3
S278 Construction Details - 1115-2611-CIV-130 P1
Street Lighting Detail - Received 14th July 2026
Stage 1 and 2 Road Safety Audit - Received 14th July 2026

unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved access, roads and footways, and their management, shall then be fully

implemented throughout the lifetime of the development.

Reason

In the interests of highway safety and amenity in accordance with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018).

5 Condition

Prior to occupation of any dwelling, final details of how water will be reused and recycled on site shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Once approved, the details shall be adhered to at all times following first occupation of each dwelling.

Reason

To ensure the efficient use of water and to accord with Policy 34 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018).

6 Condition

The scheme of landscaping and tree planting shown on drawing no. RD6129-07 REV-A (Proposed Landscaping Plan) shall be completed within a period of 12 months, beginning with the date on which development began or within such longer period as may be first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All planting shall be adequately maintained for 5 years, beginning with the date of completion of the scheme and during that period all losses shall be replaced during the next planting season.

Reason

To ensure a satisfactory appearance and setting for the development and continued maintenance of the approved landscaping in the interests of local amenity in accordance with Policies 5 and 42 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018).

7 Condition

Prior to occupation of the dwellings, the boundary treatments as detailed on drawing Proposed Site Plan - RD:6129 - 03 REV D (Proposed Site Plan) and RD:6129 - 06 REV C (Proposed External Works Plan) shall be installed and thereafter retained. Notwithstanding, the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (Amended) (or any statutory amendment thereto), no development under Schedule 2 Part 2, Class A shall be permitted.

Reason

In the interests of residential and local amenity in accordance with Policies 5 and 22 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018).

8 Condition

The ecological mitigation measures and enhancements shall be carried out in

accordance with the Construction Ecological Management Plan (dated April 2026 by CGC Ecology), the Street Lighting Detail (received 14th July 2026) and the Ecology Survey update (dated April 2026 by CGC Ecology). The mitigation shall be provided prior to the occupation of the dwellings to which it relates and shall thereafter be so retained.

Reason

In the interests of ecological enhancement in accordance with Policies 5 and 41 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018).

Informatives

- 1 Reason for Approval
The Local Planning Authority has had regard to development plan policies and especially those in the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan. The proposal would not harm the area character or residential amenity and is acceptable under all other planning considerations. This proposal is approved in accordance with the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018), in particular policies 5, 22, 33, 34, 38, 41 and 42.
- 2 Added Value Statement
Article 31(1)(cc) Statement - Positive and Proactive Approach
In accordance with paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework, the Local Authority has worked in a positive and proactive manner with the applicant to seek solutions to problems arising, by requesting additional information to overcome concerns.
- 3 Informative
Please note that you may also require Building Regulations, including EV charging points. You are advised to contact them in advance of work on site commencing (Tel: 01472 326289 - Option 2).
- 4 Informative
This application will require the creation of new postal addresses. You are advised to contact the Street Naming & Numbering Team on 01472 323579 or via email at snn@nelincs.gov.uk to discuss the creation of new addresses.
- 5 Informative
The applicant's attention is drawn to the comments from the Public Right of Way Officer and Humberside Fire and Rescue. Please also review the Cadent Gas comments under DM/0493/22/OUT. Please go to www.nelincs.gov.uk to view the comments.

- 6 Informative
Existing ground levels should not be increased otherwise surface water drainage problems may result.

- 7 Informative
The applicant should be aware that there are conditions from the outline permission are still relevant and need to be met and/or formally addressed through a discharge of conditions application. Please discuss with the Planning Officer.

Minute of the Planning Committee 30th September 2026

Item: 4

Application Number: DM/0328/26/FUL

Application Type: Full Application

Application Site: Land To South Of The Georgian House Main Road
Barnoldby Le Beck North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Erection of 3 detached dwellings, 1 detached double garage
an attenuation pond, alterations to access and associated
works (Amended Ownership Certificate)

Applicant's Name and Address: Mark Barford 50B St Marys Lane Louth Lincolnshire LN11 0DT	Agent's Name and Address: Mr Glenn Jeffrey Faber Architecture Ltd 33 Lee Street Louth LN11 9HJ
--	--

Deposited: 7th May 2026

Accepted: 20th July 2026

Expiry Date: 14th September 2026

Agreed Extension of Time Date:

Case Officer: Bethany Loring

Decision: Refused

- 1 The proposed development is located outside of the development boundary as established through the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013 -2032 (Adopted 2018) and shown upon the proposals map as within open countryside. The proposal is not supported by exceptional reasons to allow the development within the open countryside. The adverse impacts are not justified by the shortfall in the supply of deliverable housing and its location extending into the open countryside causing visual harm through the physical build which would be highly visible to local receptors including users of the right of way and resulting in an unsustainable residential environment. The development would be contrary to Policies 3 and 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013 -2032 (adopted

2018) and advice in the National Planning Policy Framework 2026.

Informative

1 Informative

This application has been considered using the plans referenced:

- Site Location Plan - 2113 PL011 00
- Proposed Site Plan - 211-PL013-01
- Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations (House 1) - 2113 PL021 00
- Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations (House 2) - 2113 PL022 00
- Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations (House 3) - 2113 PL023 00

Minute of the Planning Committee 30th September 2026

Item: 5

Application Number: DM/0732/25/OUT

Application Type: Outline Application

Application Site: Wayside Brigsley Road Waltham North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Outline application to erect two dwellings and associated accesses with all matters reserved

Applicant's Name and Address: Mr & Mrs Miall Wayside Brigsley Road Waltham Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN37 0LA	Agent's Name and Address: Mr Dieter Nelson Dieter Nelson Planning Consultancy Unit 12 Cleethorpes Business Centre Jackson Place, Wilton Road Humberston Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN36 4AS
--	---

Deposited: 19th August 2025

Accepted: 9th October 2025

Expiry Date: 4th December 2025

Agreed Extension of Time Date:

Case Officer: Mark Danforth

Decision: Approved with Conditions

- 1 Condition
Applications for approval of the matters referred to in Condition 2 (known as reserved matters) shall be made within three years of the date of this permission and the development to which it relates shall begin no later than whichever is the later of the following dates:
 - (a) three years from the date of the grant of outline planning permission
 - (b) two years from the final approval of the reserved matters, or in the case of

approval on different dates, final approval of the last such matter to be approved.

Reason

This permission is in outline only and the information is necessary for consideration of the detailed proposal as required by S.92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2 Condition

This permission hereby granted is in outline form only and no development shall begin until full details of the following reserved matters have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority:

- (a) the layout, scale and appearance of the development including materials, boundary treatments, proposed levels and bin storage;
- (b) a full Tree report BS5837 including details of existing trees, hedges and planting to be retained and any to be removed as well as an up-to-date tree protection plan and an arboricultural method statement;
- (c) a landscaping scheme for the site that accords with the recommendations of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and a maintenance plan.

Reason

This permission is in outline only and the information is necessary for consideration of the detailed proposal as required by S.92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3 Condition

The development is approved in accordance with the following plans:

Site Location Plan - 1242-0101B

Existing Plan - 1242 - 0102B

Proposed Indicative Proposed Block Plan - 1242-0103 B

Reason

For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning to accord with Policies 2, 3, 4, 5, 22, 33, 34, 38, 41 and 42 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018).

4 Condition

No demolition or construction work shall be carried out on or before 08:00 or after 18:00 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, before 08:00 or after 13:00 on Saturdays and at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Reason

To protect the amenities of nearby residents to accord with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018).

5 Condition

A method statement including details of noise and dust reduction measures to be employed during the course of construction are to be submitted and agreed with the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development. No burning of demolition/construction waste material shall take place on site. The techniques shall be applied as agreed.

Reason

To ensure that noise levels and dust emissions arising from the development are within acceptable levels, and in the interests of amenity to accord with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018).

6 Condition

No development shall commence until a scheme for the provision of foul and surface water drainage has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Included shall be a scheme of maintenance. This shall also include details of the management of the associated ditch along the northern boundary for which maintenance is the responsibility of the riparian owners, i.e. the land owners on or adjacent to the watercourse. Such scheme shall be implemented as approved prior to occupation of any dwelling. It shall be retained and maintained as approved thereafter.

Reason

To prevent an increased risk of flooding by ensuring the provision of a satisfactory means of foul and surface water disposal and management of the ditch to accord with Policy 34 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018).

7 Condition

Development shall not begin until details showing the location, layout, design and method of construction of any new or altered vehicular access, parking and manoeuvring space, including any necessary piping or culverting of any ditch or watercourse and visibility splays have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and before the development hereby permitted is brought into use the vehicular access, parking and manoeuvring space shall be constructed in accordance with those approved details and shall thereafter be so retained.

Reason

To ensure adequate parking and turning facilities are provided within the site and for highway safety reasons to accord with Policies 5 and 38 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018).

8 Condition

No works related to the development hereby approved shall begin until a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CTMP should include, but not be limited to the following:

1. Contact details of the person with responsibility for the implementation of the CTMP;
2. The expected number, types and size of vehicles during the entire construction period;
3. The proposed daily hours of operation during the construction period;
4. Details of on-site parking provision for construction related vehicles;
5. Details of on-site storage areas for materials, if required;
6. Details of expected delivery schedules and how this will be managed to eliminate waiting on the public highway (i.e. call ahead or pre-booking scheduling system), if required; and
7. Details of wheel washing facilities (locations, types etc.).

Once approved, the CTMP shall be adhered to at all times during construction.

Reason

To ensure adequate access facilities are provided during construction, and for highway safety reasons to accord with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018).

9 Condition

Before any development on site commences a scheme for the protection of footpath No. 72 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented in its entirety and the footpath kept open and protected at all times during the construction period unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

To ensure the integrity of footpath No. 72 is maintained at all times to accord with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018).

10 Condition

No part of the development hereby permitted shall be brought into use until all drives and any parking or turning areas are surfaced in a hard bound material (not loose gravel) for a minimum of 10m behind the Highway boundary. They shall then be maintained in such hard bound material for the life of the development.

Reason

To reduce the possibility of deleterious material being deposited on the public highway (loose stones, etc.) to accord with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018).

11 Condition

The development shall adhere to the Preliminary Ecology Appraisal from CGC Ecology dated May 2026 and prior to the commencement of development, details of the ecological enhancements including a timescale for implementation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Once approved, the measures shall be carried out as approved and retained thereafter.

Reason

To ensure matters of nature conservation interest are afforded protection and ecology is enhanced to accord with Policy 41 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018).

12 Condition

Prior to development commencing, a Construction Environmental Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall adhere to the detailed advice by the Ecology Team uploaded 2nd September 2026 including precautionary working methods. Once approved, development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Plan.

Reason

To ensure matters of nature conservation interest are afforded protection to accord with Policy 41 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (Adopted 2018).

13 Condition

Prior to any dwelling hereby approved being occupied a scheme to meet the water efficiency standard of 110 litres per person per day per unit shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Once approved, each dwelling shall not be occupied until the measures for it are installed as agreed. They shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason

In the interests of water management and efficiency and in accordance with Policies 5 and 34 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013 - 2032 (Adopted 2018).

14 Biodiversity Net Gain

The effect of paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that planning permission granted for the development of land in England is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition "(the biodiversity gain condition)" that development may not begin unless:

- (a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority, and
- (b) the planning authority has approved the plan.

The planning authority, for the purposes of determining whether to approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan if one is required in respect of this permission, would be North East Lincolnshire Council, or the Secretary of State (where they have determined under sections 62A, 76A or 77 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) that such applications must be made to them) or the Planning Inspectorate or Secretary of state where they have so specified in determining an appeal under s 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

(as amended).

There are statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements which mean that the biodiversity gain condition does not always apply. It is the applicant or developers responsibility to make sure that they are complying with the requirements of this legislation.

Where this permission has the effect of requiring or permitting the development to proceed in phases, the modifications in respect of the biodiversity gain condition which are set out in Part 2 of the Biodiversity Gain (Town and Country Planning) (Modifications and Amendments) (England) Regulations 2024 apply.

In Summary: Based on the information available this permission is considered to be one which will not require the approval of a biodiversity gain plan before development is begun because one or more of the statutory exemptions or transitional arrangements in the list below is/are considered to apply. It is considered that exemption number 4.5 applies.

Statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements in respect of the biodiversity gain condition can be found at <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/biodiversity-net-gain-exempt-developments>.

1. The application for planning permission was made before 12 February 2024.

2. The planning permission relates to development to which section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (planning permission for development already carried out) applies.

3. The planning permission was granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and
(i) the original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates* was granted before 12 February 2024; or
(ii) the application for the original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates was made before 12 February 2024.

4. The permission which has been granted is for development which is exempt being:

4.1 Development which is not 'major development' (within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015) where:

i) the application for planning permission was made before 2 April 2024;
ii) planning permission is granted which has effect before 2 April 2024; or
iii) planning permission is granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 where the original permission to which the section 73 permission relates* was exempt by virtue of (i) or (ii).

* "original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates" means a planning permission which is the first in a sequence of two or more planning permissions, where the second and any subsequent planning permissions are section 73 planning permissions.

4.2 Development below the de minimis threshold, meaning development which:
i) does not impact an onsite priority habitat (a habitat specified in a list published under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006); and

ii) impacts less than 25 square metres of onsite habitat that has biodiversity value greater than zero and less than 5 metres in length of onsite linear habitat (as defined in the statutory metric).

4.3 Development which is subject of a householder application within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. A "householder application" means an application for planning permission for development for an existing dwellinghouse, or development within the curtilage of such a dwellinghouse for any purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse which is not an application for change of use or an application to change the number of dwellings in a building.

4.4 Development of a biodiversity gain site, meaning development which is undertaken solely or mainly for the purpose of fulfilling, in whole or in part, the Biodiversity Gain Planning condition which applies in relation to another development, (no account is to be taken of any facility for the public to access or to use the site for educational or recreational purposes, if that access or use is permitted without the payment of a fee).

4.5 Self and Custom Build Development, meaning development which:

i) consists of no more than 9 dwellings;

ii) is carried out on a site which has an area no larger than 0.5 hectares; and

iii) consists exclusively of dwellings which are self-build or custom housebuilding (as defined in section 1(A1) of the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015).

4.5 Development forming part of, or ancillary to, the high speed railway transport network (High Speed 2) comprising connections between all or any of the places or parts of the transport network specified in section 1(2) of the High Speed Rail (Preparation) Act 2013.

Irreplaceable habitat

If the onsite habitat includes irreplaceable habitat (within the meaning of the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Irreplaceable Habitat) Regulations 2024) there are additional requirements for the content and approval of Biodiversity Gain Plans.

The Biodiversity Gain Plan must include, in addition to information about steps taken or to be taken to minimise any adverse effect of the development on the habitat, information on arrangements for compensation for any impact the development has on the biodiversity of the irreplaceable habitat.

The planning authority can only approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan if satisfied that the adverse effect of the development on the biodiversity of the irreplaceable habitat is minimised and appropriate arrangements have been made for the

purpose of compensating for any impact which do not include the use of biodiversity credits.

The effect of section 73D of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990
If planning permission is granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (application to develop land without compliance with conditions previously attached) and a Biodiversity Gain Plan was approved in relation to the previous planning permission ("the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan") there are circumstances when the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan is regarded as approved for the purpose of discharging the biodiversity gain condition subject to which the section 73 planning permission is granted.

Those circumstances are that the conditions subject to which the section 73 permission is granted:

- i) do not affect the post-development value of the onsite habitat as specified in the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan, and
- ii) in the case of planning permission for a development where all or any part of the onsite habitat is irreplaceable habitat the conditions do not change the effect of the development on the biodiversity of that onsite habitat (including any arrangements made to compensate for any such effect) as specified in the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan.

Informatives

- 1 Reason for Approval
The Local Planning Authority has had regard to development plan policies and especially those in the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan. The proposal would not harm the area character or residential amenity and is acceptable under all other planning considerations. This proposal is approved in accordance with the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018), in particular policies 3, 4, 5, 22, 33, 34, 38, 41 and 42.
- 2 Article 31(1)(cc) Statement - Positive and Proactive Approach
No problems have arisen during consideration of this application that have required working directly with the applicant to seek solutions.
- 3 Informative
The development will need to check with Approved Document S of the Building Regulations as it may be required to install electric vehicle charging points as part of the development.
- 4 Informative
Existing ground levels should not be raised or surface water drainage problems

may result. There must be no surface water discharge onto the public highway.

5 Informative

Please note that the exemption in regards to BNG is based on the information provided, should any information change in relation to your proposal you are advised to contact the Local Planning Authority for advice.

6 Informative

Under the Environmental Protection Act 1990, Section 34 (2A), it is the duty of the occupier of any domestic property in England to take all such measures available to him as are reasonable in the circumstances to secure that any transfer by him of household waste produced on the property is only to an authorised person or to a person for authorised transport purposes.

Under the Environmental Protection Act 1990, Section 46, occupants must adhere to the Councils 'Waste and Recycling Collection Service Policy' in relation to the requirements in place for domestic waste collections. This policy and further information on waste collection and recycling within NELC can be found on the application file.

7 Informative

Please note the informative advice provided by Cadent Gas and ESP Utilities on the application relating to their assets.

Minute of the Planning Committee 30th September 2026

Item: 6

Application Number: DM/0881/25/FUL

Application Type: Full Application

Application Site: Rear Of 116 Humberston Avenue Humberston Grimsby
North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Erect 2 dwellings with integral garages, boundary treatments, solar panels, landscaping, formation of new vehicular access and various associated works (amended plans received July 2026)

Applicant's Name and Address: Mr G Hall 116 Humberston Avenue Humberston Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN36 4SU	Agent's Name and Address: Mr Dieter Nelson Dieter Nelson Planning Consultancy Ltd Unit 12 Cleethorpes Business Centre Jackson Place Wilton Road Humberston Grimsby North East Lincolnshire DN36 4AS
--	---

Deposited: 15th October 2025

Accepted: 6th November 2025

Expiry Date: 1st January 2026

Agreed Extension of Time Date: 5th October 2026

Case Officer: Becca Soulsby

Decision: Approved with Conditions

- 1 Condition
The development hereby permitted shall begin within three years of the date of this permission.

Reason

To comply with S.91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2 Condition

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans and documents:

210106 REV G - Site Location Plan, Existing and Proposed Site Plans

210107 REV I - Plots 1 and 2 Infrastructure Plan

210112 REV B - Proposed Site Sections

210113 - Plot 1 Proposed Plans and Elevations

210114 REV A - Plot 2 Proposed Plans and Elevations

210115 REV C - Existing and Proposed Driveway Entrance Profiles

Design and Access Statement received 15th October 2025

Arboricultural Report received 15th October 2025

Arboricultural Report and Impact Assessment received 15th October 2025

Drainage Statement received 15th October 2025

Reason

For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning in accordance with Policies 5, 22, 33, 34, 41 and 42 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

3 Condition

Prior to commencement of construction for the dwellings hereby approved, final external material details, including the proposed solar panel specification shall be provided for both Plots 1 and 2. The development shall proceed in strict accordance with the materials and details unless otherwise first approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

For the avoidance of doubt in the interests of proper planning and in accordance with Policies 5 and 22 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

4 Condition

Surface water drainage shall be via the sustainable drainage detail shown on the approved plans which shall be installed before the dwellings are brought into use and shall thereafter be so retained unless an alternative is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

In the interests of flood risk and drainage and to accord with Policy 34 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

5 Condition

No works related to the development hereby approved shall begin until a Construction and Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CTMP should include, but not be limited to the following:

1. Contact details of the person with responsibility for the implementation of the CTMP;
2. The expected number, types and size of vehicles during the entire construction period;
3. The proposed daily hours of operation during the construction period;
4. Details of on-site parking provision for construction related vehicles;
5. Details of on-site storage areas for materials, this should be outside of any tree root protection areas;
6. Details of expected delivery schedules and how this will be managed to eliminate waiting on the public highway (i.e. call ahead or pre-booking scheduling system), if required;
7. Details of wheel washing facilities (locations, types etc.);
8. An Arboricultural Method Statement; and
9. Measures for tree protection.

Once approved, the CTMP shall be adhered to at all times during construction any all tree protection fencing shall be installed before construction commences. It shall remain on site throughout all construction unless, otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

To ensure adequate access facilities are provided during construction, and for highway safety and landscape reasons and to accord with Policies 5 and 42 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

6 Condition

Development shall proceed in strict accordance with 'Plots 1 and 2 Infrastructure Plan' Ref 210107 REV I. Any excavation for the purposes of constructing the access driveway within the Root Protection Area of T1 and T2 of the Tree Report, shall be 100mm. Any requirement to exceed 100mm must be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Included shall be full details of the change and the appropriate justification. Once approved, all works shall proceed in strict accordance with the agreed details.

Reason

To protect existing trees and to accord with Policies 5 and 42 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

7 Condition

Following completion of construction works and before the access is brought into use or the final surface treatment is installed, the DBM tarmac as indicated on Plan 210115 REV C shall be removed and the new porous tarmac as indicated shall be laid. Once approved, it shall be retained to the same specification

thereafter.

Reason

To protect existing trees and to accord with Policies 5 and 42 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

8 Condition

No construction work shall be carried out on or before 08:00 or after 18:00 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, before 08:00 or after 13:00 on Saturdays and at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Reason

To protect the amenities of nearby residents in accordance with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

9 Condition

No development shall commence until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Construction Method Statement shall provide details of:

- Means of suppressing dust and noise

The development shall thereafter be carried out only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason

To protect the amenities of nearby residents in accordance with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

10 Condition

No dwelling shall be occupied until a scheme for water re-use to achieve an efficiency standard of 110 litres per person per day has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Once approved, the dwellings shall be occupied in strict accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter.

Reason

In the interests of efficient water management and to accord with Policies 5 and 34 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

11 Condition

Prior to development commencing a scheme for the inclusion of swift boxes for each dwelling shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall then be built out in accordance with the approved details prior to occupation and shall thereafter be retained.

Reason

In the interest of biodiversity improvements in accordance with Policy 41 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

12 Biodiversity Net Gain

The effect of paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that planning permission granted for the development of land in England is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition "(the biodiversity gain condition)" that development may not begin unless:

- (a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority, and
- (b) the planning authority has approved the plan.

The planning authority, for the purposes of determining whether to approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan if one is required in respect of this permission, would be North East Lincolnshire Council, or the Secretary of State (where they have determined under sections 62A, 76A or 77 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) that such applications must be made to them) or the Planning Inspectorate or Secretary of state where they have so specified in determining an appeal under s 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

There are statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements which mean that the biodiversity gain condition does not always apply. It is the applicant or developers responsibility to make sure that they are complying with the requirements of this legislation.

Where this permission has the effect of requiring or permitting the development to proceed in phases, the modifications in respect of the biodiversity gain condition which are set out in Part 2 of the Biodiversity Gain (Town and Country Planning) (Modifications and Amendments) (England) Regulations 2024 apply.

In Summary: Based on the information available this permission is considered to be one which will not require the approval of a biodiversity gain plan before development is begun because one or more of the statutory exemptions or transitional arrangements in the list below is/are considered to apply. It is considered that exemption number 4.5 applies.

Statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements in respect of the biodiversity gain condition can be found at <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/biodiversity-net-gain-exempt-developments>.

1. The application for planning permission was made before 12 February 2024.
2. The planning permission relates to development to which section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (planning permission for development already carried out) applies.
3. The planning permission was granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and

- (i) the original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates* was granted before 12 February 2024; or
- (ii) the application for the original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates was made before 12 February 2024.

4. The permission which has been granted is for development which is exempt being:

4.1 Development which is not 'major development' (within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015) where:

- i) the application for planning permission was made before 2 April 2024;
- ii) planning permission is granted which has effect before 2 April 2024; or
- iii) planning permission is granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 where the original permission to which the section 73 permission relates* was exempt by virtue of (i) or (ii).

* "original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates" means a planning permission which is the first in a sequence of two or more planning permissions, where the second and any subsequent planning permissions are section 73 planning permissions.

4.2 Development below the de minimis threshold, meaning development which:

- i) does not impact an onsite priority habitat (a habitat specified in a list published under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006); and

- ii) impacts less than 25 square metres of onsite habitat that has biodiversity value greater than zero and less than 5 metres in length of onsite linear habitat (as defined in the statutory metric).

4.3 Development which is subject of a householder application within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. A "householder application" means an application for planning permission for development for an existing dwellinghouse, or development within the curtilage of such a dwellinghouse for any purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse which is not an application for change of use or an application to change the number of dwellings in a building.

4.4 Development of a biodiversity gain site, meaning development which is undertaken solely or mainly for the purpose of fulfilling, in whole or in part, the Biodiversity Gain Planning condition which applies in relation to another development, (no account is to be taken of any facility for the public to access or to use the site for educational or recreational purposes, if that access or use is permitted without the payment of a fee).

4.5 Self and Custom Build Development, meaning development which:

- i) consists of no more than 9 dwellings;
- ii) is carried out on a site which has an area no larger than 0.5 hectares; and
- iii) consists exclusively of dwellings which are self-build or custom housebuilding (as defined in section 1(A1) of the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act

2015).

4.5 Development forming part of, or ancillary to, the high speed railway transport network (High Speed 2) comprising connections between all or any of the places or parts of the transport network specified in section 1(2) of the High Speed Rail (Preparation) Act 2013.

Irreplaceable habitat

If the onsite habitat includes irreplaceable habitat (within the meaning of the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Irreplaceable Habitat) Regulations 2024) there are additional requirements for the content and approval of Biodiversity Gain Plans.

The Biodiversity Gain Plan must include, in addition to information about steps taken or to be taken to minimise any adverse effect of the development on the habitat, information on arrangements for compensation for any impact the development has on the biodiversity of the irreplaceable habitat.

The planning authority can only approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan if satisfied that the adverse effect of the development on the biodiversity of the irreplaceable habitat is minimised and appropriate arrangements have been made for the purpose of compensating for any impact which do not include the use of biodiversity credits.

The effect of section 73D of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

If planning permission is granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (application to develop land without compliance with conditions previously attached) and a Biodiversity Gain Plan was approved in relation to the previous planning permission ("the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan") there are circumstances when the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan is regarded as approved for the purpose of discharging the biodiversity gain condition subject to which the section 73 planning permission is granted.

Those circumstances are that the conditions subject to which the section 73 permission is granted:

- i) do not affect the post-development value of the onsite habitat as specified in the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan, and
- ii) in the case of planning permission for a development where all or any part of the onsite habitat is irreplaceable habitat the conditions do not change the effect of the development on the biodiversity of that onsite habitat (including any arrangements made to compensate for any such effect) as specified in the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan.

1 Reason for Approval

The Local Planning Authority has had regard to development plan policies and especially those in the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan. The proposal would not harm the area character or neighbouring amenity and is acceptable under all other planning considerations. This proposal is approved in accordance with the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018), in particular Policies 5, 22, 33, 34, 41 and 42.

2 Added Value Statement

Article 31(1)(cc) Statement - Positive and Proactive Approach

In accordance with paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework, the Local Authority has worked in a positive and proactive manner with the applicant to seek solutions to problems arising, by securing amended details to alleviate a concern and undertaking negotiations to overcome concerns raised.

3 Informative

Please note that you may also require Building Regulations. You are advised to contact them in advance of work on site commencing (Tel: 01472 326289 - Option 2).

4 Informative

Please note that at least six months in advance of work commencing on site you are required to contact the Highway Management Team with respect to the formation of a vehicular access within the existing highway. This will enable a S184 licence to be granted within appropriate timescales. No works should commence within the highway boundary until such licence is obtained. (Tel: 01472 325734)

5 Informative

Cadent Gas Ltd own and operate the gas infrastructure within the area of your development. There may be a legal interest (easements and other rights) in the land that restrict activity in proximity to Cadent assets in private land. The applicant must ensure that the proposed works do not infringe on legal rights of access and or restrictive covenants that exist.

If buildings or structures are proposed directly above the apparatus the development may only take place following diversion of the apparatus. The applicant should apply online to have apparatus diverted in advance of any works, by visiting cadentgas.com/our-services/gas-diversions.

Prior to carrying out works, including the construction of access points, please register on www.linsearchbeforeudig.co.uk to submit details of the planned works for review, ensuring requirements are adhered to.

- 6 Informative
 The applicant's attention is drawn to the comments received from ESP Utilities.

- 7 Informative
 The applicant's attention is drawn to the comments received from Anglian Water regarding surface water disposal, used water, wastewater treatment and Anglian Water assets.

- 8 Informative
 The applicant's attention is drawn to the comments received from the Environmental Enforcement Officer in respect of the relevant legislation for household waste.

- 9 Informative
 The applicant's attention is drawn to the comments received from the Waste Services Officer in respect of household bins.

Minute of the Planning Committee 30th September 2026

Item: 7

Application Number: DM/0100/25/FUL

Application Type: Full Application

Application Site: Rear Of 43 Bramhall Street Cleethorpes North East
Lincolnshire DN35 7QU

Proposal: Change of use and alterations to create 1 residential dwelling with associated works (Amended Flood Risk Assessment)

Applicant's Name and Address: Mr Joseph Everatt 43 Bramhall Street Cleethorpes North East Lincolnshire DN35 7QU	Agent's Name and Address: Mr Jonathan Hendry Jonathan Hendry Architects 10 Nickerson Way Peacefields Business Park Holton-le-Clay DN36 5HS
---	---

Deposited: 12th February 2025

Accepted: 5th March 2025

Expiry Date: 30th April 2025

Agreed Extension of Time Date: 16th June 2026

Case Officer: Mark Danforth

Decision: Approved with Conditions

- 1 Condition
The development hereby permitted shall begin within three years of the date of this permission.

Reason
To comply with S.91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2 Condition
The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans and documents:

- Site Location Plan 12-Feb-2025
- Block Plan - GA_001_A
- Proposed Elevations - GA_200_A
- Ground and First Floor Plan - GA_100_B

- 3 Condition
No conversion or construction work shall be carried out on or before 08:00 or after 18:00 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, before 08:00 or after 13:00 on Saturdays and at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Reason

To protect the amenities of nearby residents in accordance with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

- 4 Condition
The development shall proceed in strict accordance with the materials shown on the approved plans and application form unless otherwise first approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

In the interests of character and design and in accordance with Policies 5 and 22 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

- 5 Condition
The dwelling shall not be occupied until a scheme for water re-use to achieve an efficiency standard of 110 litres per person per day has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Once approved, the dwelling shall be occupied in strict accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter.

Reason

In the interests of efficient water management and to accord with Policies 5 and 34 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

- 6 Condition
Prior to construction works commencing a scheme for the inclusion of swift boxes shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall then be built out in accordance with the approved details prior to occupation and shall thereafter be retained.

Reason

In the interest of biodiversity improvements in accordance with Policy 41 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

7 Condition

Prior to occupation, the existing vehicular access rendered redundant by the development, shall be removed and the footway reinstated to provide full height kerbs in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Once approved, the access shall be removed and the land reinstated in accordance the approved details prior to any occupation.

Reason

To restore available on-street parking within an urban residential area in accordance with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

8 Condition

Prior to any conversion or construction works, final details of all flood risk mitigation, flood resilience and resistance and flood warning and evacuation details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. There shall also be no sleeping accommodation at ground floor level at any time. Once approved, the development shall be implemented in accordance with the details before occupation and thereafter retained. The dwelling shall adhere to the flood warning and evacuation details following occupation.

Reason

In the interests of flood risk and in accordance with Policy 33 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

Informatives

1 Reason for Approval

In noting the flood risk concerns, it is considered in this case that the proposal would bring significant regeneration benefits by reusing an existing outbuilding to create a dwelling which should be afforded significant weight in the balance of considerations and this combined with conditions to secure mitigation measures and flood warning and evacuation is considered to be acceptable.

2 Added Value Statement

Article 31(1)(cc) Statement - Positive and Proactive Approach

In accordance with paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework, the Local Authority has worked in a positive and proactive manner with the applicant to seek solutions to problems arising, by seeking further information on flooding.

3 Informative

Please note that at least three months in advance of work commencing to remove the existing highway vehicular access you are required to contact the Highway Management Team with respect to the removal of the vehicular access and subsequent reinstatement of full height kerbs within the existing highway. This will enable a S184 licence to be granted within appropriate timescales. No works should commence within the highway boundary until such licence is obtained. (Tel: 01472 325734).

A flower planter is to be sited along the front property boundary. Care should be taken to ensure this is not installed within the adopted highway.

4 Informative

Please note that you may also require Building Regulations. You are advised to contact them in advance of work on site commencing (Tel: 01472 326289 - Option 2).

5 Informative

This application will require the creation of new postal addresses. You are advised to contact the Street Naming & Numbering Team on 01472 323579 or via email at snn@nelincs.gov.uk to discuss the creation of new addresses.

Minute of the Planning Committee 30th September 2026

Item: 8

Application Number: DM/0300/24/FUL

Application Type: Full Application

Application Site: Land With Ponds South Of Humberston Avenue Humberston
North East Lincolnshire

Proposal: Variation of Condition 1 (Temporary Permission) pursuant to
DM/0880/21/FUL to allow for a further temporary period of 2
years

Applicant's Name and Address: Spencer Humberston Eco Conservation Centre Land With Ponds South Of Humberston Avenue Humberston Avenue Grimsby North East Lincolnshire	Agent's Name and Address: Georgina Walker Hodson Architects The Old Post Office Yarra Road Cleethorpes DN35 8LS
---	--

Deposited: 21st March 2024

Accepted: 27th March 2024

Expiry Date: 22nd May 2024

Agreed Extension of Time Date:

Case Officer: Cheryl Jarvis

Decision: Approved Limited Period

- 1 Condition
The development shall cease and the land reinstated to its former condition on or before 30th September 2028 unless, before that date, an extension of the period has been granted on a further application by the Local Planning Authority. This includes removal of the access road, buildings and car park but excludes the fishing pegs and footways.

Reason

To enable the Local Planning Authority to continue to monitor the proposal and enable the permanent community facility to come forward in accordance with Policies 5 and 22 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

2 Condition

No trees/hedges on the site shall be wilfully damaged, cut-down, up-rooted, pruned felled or destroyed without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority. If any trees/hedges on the site at the date of application shall, if they are removed or die, be replaced within 12 months by the planting of more live specimens in such numbers as may be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The landscaping on the site shall be maintained in accordance with the Landscape Management Plan approved under DM/0546/19/CND.

Reason

To preserve and ensure the continuity of existing landscape features and ensure long term maintenance of it in the interests of local amenity in accordance with Policy 42 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

3 Condition

Once the temporary access is no longer required following the construction of the permanent route (following planning approval), details of the new landscaping as is reasonably required in order to finish off the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Once approved, the scheme shall be implemented within the next available planting season.

Reason

In the interests of amenity, biodiversity and landscape in accordance with Policy 42 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

4 Condition

Drainage shall be retained as submitted and approved under DM/0546/19/CND.

Reason

To prevent the increased risk of flooding by ensuring the provision of a satisfactory means of foul and surface water disposal in accordance with Policies 5 and 34 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

5 Condition

The development is approved in accordance with the following plans:

Approved under DM/0770/18/FUL:

Site Location Plan - 2431.E000 REV B
Proposed Access Track - 2431.P000 REV B
Proposed Access Track North - 2431.P004 REV A
Proposed Access Track East - 2431.P005 REV A
Fishing Platform - C1000-012 REV B

Approved under DM/0880/21/FUL:

External Works Plan - RD4985-01-REV-0
Block Plan, Proposed Plans and Elevations - RD4985-02-REV-0

Reason

For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

6 Biodiversity Net Gain

The effect of paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that planning permission granted for the development of land in England is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition "(the biodiversity gain condition)" that development may not begin unless:

- (a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority, and
- (b) the planning authority has approved the plan.

The planning authority, for the purposes of determining whether to approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan if one is required in respect of this permission, would be North East Lincolnshire Council, or the Secretary of State (where they have determined under sections 62A, 76A or 77 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) that such applications must be made to them) or the Planning Inspectorate or Secretary of state where they have so specified in determining an appeal under s 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

There are statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements which mean that the biodiversity gain condition does not always apply. It is the applicant or developers responsibility to make sure that they are complying with the requirements of this legislation.

Where this permission has the effect of requiring or permitting the development to proceed in phases, the modifications in respect of the biodiversity gain condition which are set out in Part 2 of the Biodiversity Gain (Town and Country Planning) (Modifications and Amendments) (England) Regulations 2024 apply.

In Summary: Based on the information available this permission is considered to be one which will not require the approval of a biodiversity gain plan before development is begun because one or more of the statutory exemptions or transitional arrangements in the list below is/are considered to apply. It is considered that exemption number 3 applies.

Statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements in respect of the biodiversity

gain condition can be found at <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/biodiversity-net-gain-exempt-developments>.

1. The application for planning permission was made before 12 February 2024.

2. The planning permission relates to development to which section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (planning permission for development already carried out) applies.

3. The planning permission was granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and
(i) the original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates* was granted before 12 February 2024; or
(ii) the application for the original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates was made before 12 February 2024.

4. The permission which has been granted is for development which is exempt being:

4.1 Development which is not 'major development' (within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015) where:

i) the application for planning permission was made before 2 April 2024;
ii) planning permission is granted which has effect before 2 April 2024; or
iii) planning permission is granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 where the original permission to which the section 73 permission relates* was exempt by virtue of (i) or (ii).

* "original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates" means a planning permission which is the first in a sequence of two or more planning permissions, where the second and any subsequent planning permissions are section 73 planning permissions.

4.2 Development below the de minimis threshold, meaning development which:
i) does not impact an onsite priority habitat (a habitat specified in a list published under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006);
and

ii) impacts less than 25 square metres of onsite habitat that has biodiversity value greater than zero and less than 5 metres in length of onsite linear habitat (as defined in the statutory metric).

4.3 Development which is subject of a householder application within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. A "householder application" means an application for planning permission for development for an existing dwellinghouse, or development within the curtilage of such a dwellinghouse for any purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse which is not an application for change of use or an application to change the number of dwellings in a building.

4.4 Development of a biodiversity gain site, meaning development which is

undertaken solely or mainly for the purpose of fulfilling, in whole or in part, the Biodiversity Gain Planning condition which applies in relation to another development, (no account is to be taken of any facility for the public to access or to use the site for educational or recreational purposes, if that access or use is permitted without the payment of a fee).

4.5 Self and Custom Build Development, meaning development which:

- i) consists of no more than 9 dwellings;
- ii) is carried out on a site which has an area no larger than 0.5 hectares; and
- iii) consists exclusively of dwellings which are self-build or custom housebuilding (as defined in section 1(A1) of the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015).

4.5 Development forming part of, or ancillary to, the high speed railway transport network (High Speed 2) comprising connections between all or any of the places or parts of the transport network specified in section 1(2) of the High Speed Rail (Preparation) Act 2013.

Irreplaceable habitat

If the onsite habitat includes irreplaceable habitat (within the meaning of the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Irreplaceable Habitat) Regulations 2024) there are additional requirements for the content and approval of Biodiversity Gain Plans.

The Biodiversity Gain Plan must include, in addition to information about steps taken or to be taken to minimise any adverse effect of the development on the habitat, information on arrangements for compensation for any impact the development has on the biodiversity of the irreplaceable habitat.

The planning authority can only approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan if satisfied that the adverse effect of the development on the biodiversity of the irreplaceable habitat is minimised and appropriate arrangements have been made for the purpose of compensating for any impact which do not include the use of biodiversity credits.

The effect of section 73D of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

If planning permission is granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (application to develop land without compliance with conditions previously attached) and a Biodiversity Gain Plan was approved in relation to the previous planning permission ("the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan") there are circumstances when the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan is regarded as approved for the purpose of discharging the biodiversity gain condition subject to which the section 73 planning permission is granted.

Those circumstances are that the conditions subject to which the section 73 permission is granted:

- i) do not affect the post-development value of the onsite habitat as specified in the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan, and
- ii) in the case of planning permission for a development where all or any part of the onsite habitat is irreplaceable habitat the conditions do not change the effect of the development on the biodiversity of that onsite habitat (including any

arrangements made to compensate for any such effect) as specified in the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan.

Informatives

- 1 Reason for Approval
The Local Planning Authority has had regard to development plan policies and especially those in the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan. The continuation of the site for the approved purpose is acceptable for an extended period and would not harm the area character or residential amenity and is acceptable under all other planning considerations. This proposal is approved in accordance with the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018), in particular policies 5, 22, 29, 34, 38, 41 and 42.
- 2 Added Value Statement
Article 31(1)(cc) Statement - Positive and Proactive Approach
In accordance with paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework, the Local Authority has worked in a positive and proactive manner with the applicant to seek solutions to problems arising, by securing additional confirmation on the future plans for the site.
- 3 Informative
Please note the advice received from Humberside Fire and Rescue, which can be viewed on the Council website.
- 4 Informative
You are advised to liaise with the adjoining land owner with regards to realising a permanent access for the site.

Minute of the Planning Committee 30th September 2026

Item: 9

Application Number: DM/0546/26/FULA

Application Type: Accredited Agent - Homeholder application

Application Site: Milchester House Main Road Barnoldby Le Beck DN37 0AU

Proposal: Erect two storey side/front extension with rooflights and associated works

Applicant's Name and Address: Mr & Mrs Wade Milchester House Main Road Barnoldby Le Beck North East Lincolnshire DN37 0AU	Agent's Name and Address: Mrs Helen Lavric Robinson Design Intervention 14 The Avenue Healing North East Lincolnshire DN41 7NG
--	---

Deposited: 21st July 2026

Accepted: 21st July 2026

Expiry Date: 15th September 2026

Agreed Extension of Time Date: 2nd October 2026

Case Officer: Mark Danforth

Decision: Approved with Conditions

- 1 Condition
The development hereby permitted shall begin within three years of the date of this permission.

Reason

To comply with S.91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2 Condition
The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans:

207A.01.09A - Site Location Plan
207A.01.10A - Proposed Block Plan
207A.01.11A - Site and Tree Plan
207A.01.05A - Proposed Ground Floor Plan
207A.01.06A - Proposed First Floor Plan
207A.01.07A - Proposed Front and Rear Elevations
207A.01.08A - Proposed Side Elevations

Reason

For the avoidance of doubt in the interests of proper planning and in accordance with Policies 5, 22, 34, 41 and 42 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

- 3 Condition
No demolition or construction work shall be carried out on or before 08:00 or after 18:00 Mondays to Fridays inclusive, before 08:00 or after 13:00 on Saturdays and at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Reason

To protect the amenities of nearby residents in accordance with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

- 4 Condition
The proposal shall be constructed using materials specified within the application form and on the approved plans received unless otherwise first approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

In the interests of design and in accordance with Policies 5 and 22 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

- 5 Condition
No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a scheme for the provision of surface water drainage works has been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such scheme shall be implemented before the extension is brought into use and retained thereafter.

Reason

To prevent the increased risk of flooding by ensuring the provision of a satisfactory means of surface water disposal in accordance with Policies 5 and 34 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

6 Condition

The three first floor side windows as shown on the north east elevation of 207B.01.08A shall be obscurely glazed to a minimum level of 3 on the Pilkington Scale and shall be completed at this level prior to any occupation of the development. Once completed the windows shall be retained at this level of obscurity for the lifetime of the development.

Reason

In the interests of protecting neighbouring residential amenity in accordance with Policy 5 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018).

7 Biodiversity Net Gain

The effect of paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is that planning permission granted for the development of land in England is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition "(the biodiversity gain condition)" that development may not begin unless:

- (a) a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority, and
- (b) the planning authority has approved the plan.

The planning authority, for the purposes of determining whether to approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan if one is required in respect of this permission, would be North East Lincolnshire Council, or the Secretary of State (where they have determined under sections 62A, 76A or 77 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) that such applications must be made to them) or the Planning Inspectorate or Secretary of state where they have so specified in determining an appeal under s 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

There are statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements which mean that the biodiversity gain condition does not always apply. It is the applicant or developers responsibility to make sure that they are complying with the requirements of this legislation.

Where this permission has the effect of requiring or permitting the development to proceed in phases, the modifications in respect of the biodiversity gain condition which are set out in Part 2 of the Biodiversity Gain (Town and Country Planning) (Modifications and Amendments) (England) Regulations 2024 apply.

In Summary: Based on the information available this permission is considered to be one which will not require the approval of a biodiversity gain plan before development is begun because one or more of the statutory exemptions or transitional arrangements in the list below is/are considered to apply. It is considered that exemption number 4.3 applies.

Statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements in respect of the biodiversity gain condition can be found at <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/biodiversity-net-gain-exempt-developments>.

1. The application for planning permission was made before 12 February 2024.

2. The planning permission relates to development to which section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (planning permission for development already carried out) applies.

3. The planning permission was granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and

(i) the original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates* was granted before 12 February 2024; or

(ii) the application for the original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates was made before 12 February 2024.

4. The permission which has been granted is for development which is exempt being:

4.1 Development which is not 'major development' (within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015) where:

i) the application for planning permission was made before 2 April 2024;

ii) planning permission is granted which has effect before 2 April 2024; or

iii) planning permission is granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 where the original permission to which the section 73 permission relates* was exempt by virtue of (i) or (ii).

* "original planning permission to which the section 73 planning permission relates" means a planning permission which is the first in a sequence of two or more planning permissions, where the second and any subsequent planning permissions are section 73 planning permissions.

4.2 Development below the de minimis threshold, meaning development which:

i) does not impact an onsite priority habitat (a habitat specified in a list published under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006); and

ii) impacts less than 25 square metres of onsite habitat that has biodiversity value greater than zero and less than 5 metres in length of onsite linear habitat (as defined in the statutory metric).

4.3 Development which is subject of a householder application within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. A "householder application" means an application for planning permission for development for an existing dwellinghouse, or development within the curtilage of such a dwellinghouse for any purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse which is not an application for change of use or an application to change the number of dwellings in a building.

4.4 Development of a biodiversity gain site, meaning development which is undertaken solely or mainly for the purpose of fulfilling, in whole or in part, the Biodiversity Gain Planning condition which applies in relation to another development, (no account is to be taken of any facility for the public to access or

to use the site for educational or recreational purposes, if that access or use is permitted without the payment of a fee).

4.5 Self and Custom Build Development, meaning development which:

- i) consists of no more than 9 dwellings;
- ii) is carried out on a site which has an area no larger than 0.5 hectares; and
- iii) consists exclusively of dwellings which are self-build or custom housebuilding (as defined in section 1(A1) of the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015).

4.5 Development forming part of, or ancillary to, the high speed railway transport network (High Speed 2) comprising connections between all or any of the places or parts of the transport network specified in section 1(2) of the High Speed Rail (Preparation) Act 2013.

Irreplaceable habitat

If the onsite habitat includes irreplaceable habitat (within the meaning of the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Irreplaceable Habitat) Regulations 2024) there are additional requirements for the content and approval of Biodiversity Gain Plans.

The Biodiversity Gain Plan must include, in addition to information about steps taken or to be taken to minimise any adverse effect of the development on the habitat, information on arrangements for compensation for any impact the development has on the biodiversity of the irreplaceable habitat.

The planning authority can only approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan if satisfied that the adverse effect of the development on the biodiversity of the irreplaceable habitat is minimised and appropriate arrangements have been made for the purpose of compensating for any impact which do not include the use of biodiversity credits.

The effect of section 73D of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

If planning permission is granted on an application made under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (application to develop land without compliance with conditions previously attached) and a Biodiversity Gain Plan was approved in relation to the previous planning permission ("the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan") there are circumstances when the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan is regarded as approved for the purpose of discharging the biodiversity gain condition subject to which the section 73 planning permission is granted.

Those circumstances are that the conditions subject to which the section 73 permission is granted:

- i) do not affect the post-development value of the onsite habitat as specified in the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan, and
- ii) in the case of planning permission for a development where all or any part of the onsite habitat is irreplaceable habitat the conditions do not change the effect of the development on the biodiversity of that onsite habitat (including any arrangements made to compensate for any such effect) as specified in the earlier Biodiversity Gain Plan.

Informatives

- 1 Reason for Approval
The Local Planning Authority has had regard to development plan policies and especially those in the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan. The proposal would not harm the area character or residential amenity and is acceptable under all other planning considerations. This proposal is approved in accordance with the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013-2032 (adopted 2018), in particular policies 5, 22, 34 and 41.
- 2 Added Value Statement
Article 31(1)(cc) Statement - Positive and Proactive Approach
No problems have arisen during consideration of this application that have required working directly with the applicant to seek solutions.
- 3 Informative
Please note that you may also require Building Regulations. You are advised to contact them in advance of work on site commencing (Tel: 01472 326289 - Option 2).
- 4 Informative
Birds and bats are mobile species and frequent roofs and cavities. Bats can use 20mm gaps for roost access and will roost in any crevices, including soffits and fascias, cladding, window frames, hanging tiles, loft spaces, trees. This list is not exhaustive. There should be vigilance for nesting birds and the presence of bats before and during works. If a nesting bird or bat is discovered during works, all work must stop immediately, and a suitably qualified ecologist contacted and the Local Planning Authority informed.

Bats

All bats are strictly protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and is strengthened by the Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000. Bats are also protected by the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (as amended) 2019 and together, all this legislation makes it an offence to:

- Deliberately capture (or take), injure or kill a bat Intentionally or recklessly disturb a group of bats where the disturbance is likely to significantly affect the ability of the animals to survive, breed, or nurture their young or likely to significantly affect the local distribution or abundance of the species whether in a roost or not.
- Damage or destroy the breeding or resting place of a bat.

- Possess a bat (alive or dead) or any part of a bat Intentionally or recklessly obstruct access to a bat roost.
- Sell (or offer for sale) or exchange bats (alive or dead) or parts of bats.

A roost is defined as being any structure or place that is used for shelter or protection, and since bats regularly move roost site throughout the year, a roost retains such designation whether or not bats are present at the time.

Birds

All nesting birds are protected in law and any demolition, alteration works or vegetation removal should be done outside of the active bird season, March to August inclusive. If this is unavoidable, then a nesting bird activity check needs to be carried out by a suitably qualified person immediately prior to any removal or works. If nesting activity is present, no works or removal can be carried out until the young have fledged.

Thick and heavily dense vegetation are hard to check due to visibility and/or access for visual inspection. The precautionary approach should be applied in such cases and vegetation removal or works carried out outside of the bird active season or in leaf fall. All common wild birds are protected under The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). Under this legislation it is an offence to:

- Kill, injure or take any wild bird.
- Take, damage or destroy the nest of any wild bird while it is in use or being built.
- Take or destroy the egg of any wild bird.
- Certain rare breeding birds are listed on Schedule 1 of The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). Under this legislation they are afforded the same protection as common wild birds and are also protected against disturbance whilst building a nest or on or near a nest containing eggs/unfledged young.

Standing advice mammals

Vigilance should be maintained during site clearance works for ground mammals, including hedgehogs *Erinaceus europaeus* during the development phase. It is essential that no trenches or pipes are left uncovered overnight unless a suitable escape ramp is provided. No pipes should be left uncapped overnight.